

PA
710
D32
1908

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



The philology of the Greek Bible, its pre



3 1924 021 606 987

olin

This day

DATE DUE

DEC	2	1999	
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U.S.A.

This book was digitized by Microsoft Corporation in cooperation with Cornell University Libraries, 2007.

You may use and print this copy in limited quantity for your personal purposes, but may not distribute or provide access to it (or modified or partial versions of it) for revenue-generating or other commercial purposes.

THE PHILOLOGY OF THE
GREEK BIBLE

THE PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE

ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE

By
ADOLF DEISSMANN

*D.Theol. (Marburg), D.D. (Aberdeen); Professor of New Testament
Exegesis in the University of Heidelberg; Professor
Designate in the University of Berlin*

TRANSLATED FROM THE AUTHOR'S MS. BY
LIONEL R. M. STRACHAN, M.A., ENGLISH
LECTURER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF HEIDELBERG

HODDER AND STOUGHTON

LONDON MCMVIII

D

~~Handwritten text~~

~~Handwritten text~~

1.1516

Transferred from Barnes

DB

Bate and Tanner, The Setwood Printing Works, Frome, and London

TO
MY FRIEND
DR. J. RENDEL HARRIS

κοινὰ τὰ τῶν φίλων.

PREFACE

WHEN Dr. Rendel Harris invited me to give a series of lectures to the Cambridge Summer School of the Free Churches (July and August, 1907) on the present state of the study of the Greek Bible, I hesitated to accept the invitation because I am only able to speak English very imperfectly.

But three material considerations triumphed over the one formal objection.

In the first place, my subject, namely the Greek Bible and its scientific, particularly its linguistic study, is regarded with

singularly great interest by wide circles in the countries where English is spoken.

Secondly, it is in no small measure British scholars who, by the discovery and publication of important linguistic material, have made the most valuable contributions to Biblical philology.

Thirdly, it is to the industry and energy of British scholars that we owe a number of great works of fundamental importance to the study of the Greek Bible. These were reasons enough for me to regard the invitation to Cambridge not only as a great honour but also as a welcome opportunity to discharge a debt of gratitude to British Biblical scholarship.

There was added, moreover, the pleasant prospect of a few days spent in company

with many prominent Christians of a friendly country in the discussion of various great problems of both scientific and practical interest. I felt that I should be able to learn a great deal from the exchange of ideas, and I should be helping, according to my weak ability, to forge another small link in the chain of Anglo-German reciprocity and friendship.

These considerations were stronger than my first hesitation. I accepted, therefore, and the lectures were duly delivered at Cambridge. I look back with great pleasure to the time I spent there and the innumerable impressions, interesting and instructive, that I received. This little book, containing my lectures, goes forth with a hearty greeting to all my friends on the other side

of the Channel—my old friends and also the new ones whose acquaintance I made at Cambridge.

The lectures were first published in *The Expositor* (October, 1907–January, 1908), and the present edition in book form enables me to make a few additions that recent publications have rendered necessary.

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

HEIDELBERG,
1908.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I	
THE GREEK BIBLE AS A COMPACT UNITY—	
THE NEW LINGUISTIC RECORDS . . .	3
II	
THE PROBLEM OF “BIBLICAL” GREEK . .	39
III	
SEPTUAGINT PHILOLOGY	69
IV	
NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY . . .	100

**THE GREEK BIBLE AS A COMPACT
UNITY—THE NEW LINGUISTIC
RECORDS**

I

THE GREEK BIBLE AS A COMPACT UNITY— THE NEW LINGUISTIC RECORDS

“THE Greek Bible!”—There, in the brilliant sunshine of the south, stretched out before the student’s eye, lies the Hellenistic world as it was at the great turning-point of religious history. Alexander, the conqueror and moulder of the world, had marched with his armies towards the rising sun, bearing with him the spirit of the Greek race, and round about the Mediterranean basin the seeds of a world-wide Greek civilization had been planted in the ancient soil. In the State and in

society, in science and art, in language and religion, the Mediterranean world was in process of more or less vigorous Hellenization and consequent levelling towards uniformity.

About this time, say at the end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C., it happened that two Jewish girls, named Heraclea and Marthina, were murdered in the island of Delos. Their innocent blood cried aloud for vengeance, but the murderers were unknown. On the Great Day of Atonement, therefore, the relatives made their petition to the God of their fathers. With fervent prayers they consigned the cruel murderers to the vengeance of God and His angels, and their imprecations were immortalized on

marble tablets above the graves where the murdered girls lay buried in the island of Rheneia, which was the cemetery of Delos.

The original text of these Jewish prayers for vengeance, found at Rheneia ¹ and now preserved at Athens and Bucharest shows us the Jews of Delos, about the year 100 B.C., in possession of the Greek Old Testament. This single picture is typical. The Old Testament, as you know, had been translated from Hebrew into Greek at different times and by different persons in Egypt, beginning in the third century B.C., and the complete version is known as the Septuagint. We see then that by 100

¹ Cf. my essay, "Die Rachegebete von Rheneia," in *Philologus*, lxi. New Series, xv. (1902), pp. 252-65; reprinted in my book *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen, 1908.

B.C. the Septuagint Bible had already found its way from its home on the Nile to the remoter Jews of the Dispersion—a book from the Hellenistic world for the Hellenistic world.

It is true that in spirit it was an Eastern book, but as regards form and subject matter it was adapted to the needs of the Western world ; it was a book both of the East and the West.¹ It was not a book according to the professional ideas of the artistic literature of that age, for it was not clad in the garb of the literary language. But it was a book for the People ; for on the whole, though in many passages that would seem strange to the Greeks it did not

¹ Cf. my little sketch *Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus*, Leipzig, 1903.

conceal the peculiarity of the original text it spoke the colloquial language of the middle and lower class, as is shown especially clearly by its vocabulary and accidence. Here and there, less in some of the single books and more in others, it was unintelligible to the men of the Hellenistic world; but taken as a whole it must not be dismissed with the hasty criticism that it was an unintelligible book. Such criticism is the result of looking at the artistic Attic prose instead of at the contemporary popular language. Taken as a whole the Septuagint became emphatically a popular book—we may even say a universal book.

If the historical importance of things is to be estimated by their historical effects, how paltry must, for example, the History

of Polybius appear beside the Septuagint Bible ! Of all pre-Christian Greek literature Homer alone is comparable with this Bible in historical influence, and Homer, in spite of his enormous popularity, was never a Bible. Take the Septuagint in your hand, and you have before you the book that was the Bible of the Jews of the Dispersion and of the proselytes from the heathen ; the Bible of Philo the philosopher, Paul the Apostle, and the earliest Christian missions ; the Bible of the whole Greek-speaking Christian world ; the mother of influential daughter-versions ; the mother of the Greek New Testament.

But is that true ? Is the Septuagint really the mother of the Greek New Testament ? It seems a bold statement to

make, but it is not difficult to show what I mean by it.

The Septuagint was not necessary for the coming of the Lord Jesus. The Semitic, not the Greek, Old Testament was a constituent factor in His Gospel. The historical Jesus of Nazareth takes His stand firmly on the non-Greek Old Testament. But Paul, the preacher and propagator of the Gospel, is not comprehensible without the Septuagint. He is not only the great Christ-Christian but also the great Septuagint-Christian. And the whole of Primitive Christianity, so far as it is missionary Christianity, rests on the Lord and the Gospels as one pillar, and on the Septuagint Bible as the other. Through the Pauline Epistles and all the other earliest Christian

writings the words of the Septuagint run like veins of silver.

We shall not, however, speak of the Septuagint as the mother of the New Testament in the sense that without it the separate parts of the New Testament would not have been written. They arose as echoes of the prophecies of Jesus and as the reflex of His personality. But in respect to their contents they are immensely indebted to the Septuagint Bible, and—this is for us the matter of most importance—the parts would never have grown into the New Testament as a whole—the Canon—but for the Septuagint. The Old Greek Canon of Scripture is presupposed by the New. The history of religion displays the marvellous spectacle of the Old Bible,

encircled by the apparently unscalable walls of the Canon, opening wide her gates and admitting a New Bible to the sacred precinct: the Saviour and His disciples take their places by Moses and the prophets. This cohesion between the New Testament and the Old was historically possible only because the Old Testament by its Hellenization had become assimilated in advance to the future New Testament.

The daughter belongs of right to the mother; the Greek Old and New Testaments form by their contents and by their fortunes an inseparable unity. The oldest manuscript Bibles that we possess are complete Bibles in Greek. But what history has joined together, doctrine has put asunder; the Greek Bible has been torn in

halves. On the table of our theological students you will generally see the Hebrew Old Testament lying side by side with the Greek New Testament. It is one of the most painful deficiencies of Biblical study at the present day that the reading of the Septuagint has been pushed into the background, while its exegesis has been scarcely even begun.

All honour to the Hebrew original ! But the proverbial *Novum in Vetere latet* cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of the Septuagint. A single hour lovingly devoted to the text of the Septuagint will further our exegetical knowledge of the Pauline Epistles more than a whole day spent over a commentary.

We must read the Septuagint as a Greek

text and as a book of the people, just as the Jew of the Dispersion would have done who knew no Hebrew, and as the converted heathen of the first and second century would have read it. Every reader of the Septuagint who knows his Greek Testament will after a few days' study come to see with astonishment what hundreds of threads there are uniting the Old and the New. By underlining all the parallels and reciprocally illustrative passages it is easy to render this impression concrete and permanent.

Many pages there are which we shall be able to read without difficulty. Then, it is true, we shall meet with obscurities here and there, peculiarities and rare words, where our lexicons give us no real information. For the present let us simply pass over

whatever is doubtful. After all the total impression will not be, "Here is a book unintelligible to a Greek but containing some things that he could understand," but, "Here is a text intelligible to him as a whole but with some obscurities." These obscurities did not prevent the Septuagint from influencing the Graeco-Jewish and Graeco-Christian world, and even to-day only pedants will be deterred by them from reading the Septuagint.

He who does read, however, will be amply rewarded. An empty abstraction will have acquired reality; a forgotten Bible will have been re-discovered; a sacred relic, buried in sand and dust and unobserved by hundreds of passers by, will have attracted the pious eye for which it waited.

And that eye perceives that the re-discovered Septuagint is the sanctuary leading to the Holy of Holies, namely the New Testament, and that both together make up the one great temple, the Bible.

This connexion between the two Greek Testaments will be recognized more and more with the progress of scientific research. In the study of Hellenistic civilization, i.e., the civilization of the Hellenistic world of the Mediterranean in the post-Alexandrian and Imperial ages, a study which has developed so enormously during the last twenty or thirty years, it will be more and more clearly recognized that amid the vast mass of witnesses to that civilization the Greek Bible (Old and New Testament) is the chief.

It deserves to be so regarded not only for the special character of its form and contents, betokening as they do a union of the Eastern with the Western spirit altogether remarkable in the history of the world, but also on account of the mighty influence it exerted. To see things in their true historical perspective we must place the Greek Bible in the midst of the other witnesses to the contemporary Hellenistic world. This restoration of the Greek Bible to its own epoch is really the distinctive feature of the work of modern Bible scholarship ; and by utilizing the newly discovered texts of the Hellenistic age fresh vigour has been infused into Bible scholarship, reviving and rejuvenating that somewhat torpid and inactive organism.

What are these newly discovered texts ? Your thoughts fly at first perhaps to newly found books or fragments of ancient authors. But valuable though these discoveries are, the chief importance attaches to the non-literary texts, especially those on stone, papyrus, and fragments of pottery, which have been brought to light in their thousands and ten thousands. The inscriptions, papyri, and potsherds form a great storehouse of exact information, from which Biblical research has recently drawn as rich supplies as any other branch of the science of antiquities.

The *Inscriptions* are found in astonishing numbers on the site of the ancient seats of civilization on the shores of the Mediterranean, either in their original positions or

lying under ruins and mounds of rubbish. In the latter case they have to be excavated, and some of them find a home in our museums. They are rendered accessible by publication in great cyclopaedic works, the two largest of which are the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* and the *Inscriptiones Graecae*, the latter gradually replacing the older and now obsolete *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*.

The period of the discovery of new inscriptions is by no means ended. The researches and excavations of the European and American archaeological institutes, and the archaeological expeditions sent out by various governments or by private individuals, bring to light innumerable inscribed stones year by year. To these agencies we

must add the engineering enterprises for opening up the old Mediterranean countries to modern industry and commerce, which are not always harmful but in many cases helpful to the study of antiquities.

A particularly interesting example of an unexpected find came under my notice in the spring of 1906. My friend Theodor Wiegand showed me among the extensive ruins of ancient Miletus, now being excavated by him, the remains of a temple of Apollo Delphinios, the paving stones of which consisted chiefly of highly important ancient documents in stone. The encroachments of the surface water had at some period made it necessary to raise the level of the floor, and to effect this a number

of old inscribed slabs had been laid face downwards on the original marble pavement. By turning them up Wiegand had discovered quite a collection of entirely new inscriptions—the archives, one may almost say, of ancient Miletus.

The student of the Greek Bible is of course most interested in the inscriptions found in Egypt, the country that gave birth to the Septuagint, and in the centres of early Christianity, i.e., Syria, Asia Minor, and Greece. At the present moment excavations are in progress that are certainly full of promise in this direction, not only at Miletus and at Didyma, where the oracle of Miletus was situated, but also at Ephesus, Pergamos, and Corinth. The total wealth of the epigraphical material

from the oldest seats of Greek Christianity will be appreciated when the great Corpus of the Inscriptions of Asia Minor as planned by the Austrian archaeologists is completed. Some conception of it can be formed even now by reading the books of Sir William Ramsay¹ or by studying the inscriptions of a single small town, such as those of Magnesia on the Maeander, published by

¹ Works by Sir William Mitchell Ramsay :—*The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, London, 1893 ; 7th ed., 1903. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, Oxford, 1895. *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, London, 1895 ; 3rd ed., 1897. *Was Christ born at Bethlehem? A Study on the Credibility of St. Luke*, London, 1898. *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1899. *The Education of Christ*, London, 1902. *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, London, 1904. *Pauline and other Studies in Early Christian History*, London, 1906. *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire*, London, 1906. *The Cities of St. Paul : their Influence on his Life and Thought*, London, 1907.

Otto Kern,¹ or those of Priene by Hiller von Gaertringen.²

Neither in form nor in subject-matter do the inscriptions make a uniform group. When they are of official origin, the work of kings, emperors, high dignitaries, civic authorities, they are usually very carefully expressed and written in literary Greek. When they are the work of private individuals they are not infrequently done rather carelessly and are more or less specimens of the colloquial language. This is particularly the case with the private inscriptions of the Roman Imperial period, which for this reason are valuable for Biblical purposes,

¹ *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, herausgegeben von Otto Kern, Berlin, 1900.

² *Inschriften von Priene*, herausgegeben von F. Frhr. Hiller von Gaertringen, Berlin, 1906.

since the Greek Bible itself is for the most part a monument of the spoken, not of the written language. The inscriptions are fruitful to Biblical philology chiefly from the lexical point of view.

These epigraphical remains of antiquity have for centuries attracted the attention of scholars, and Biblical exegesis has turned them to account since the end of the eighteenth century. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century they were reinforced by a large new group of texts written on what would seem to be a most perishable material, viz., the *Papyri*.

Suppose that in the course of casual excavations in a mound of absolutely dry sand we were to find to-day whole bundles of original private letters, contracts, wills,

records of judicial proceedings, and government documents, emanating from our ancestors of the tenth century A.D.—the whole of the learned world would be interested in the discovery. How few original letters, for example, written by humble individuals have come down to us from the olden time. The record of history has taken notice only of the great. The scanty memorials of the common people are found scattered here and there—on a weathered tombstone, maybe, or noted by chance in the reports of legal cases or in the account books of towns or shires.

So was it formerly with our knowledge of antiquity. In so far as it was based on literary tradition it was, roughly speaking, the history of great things, the history of

nations and their leaders in politics, learning, art, and religion. Records of humble life, written memorials of the masses, were wanting. At best we caught glimpses of such insignificant persons in the comedies and some other literary works, but then they were seen in the light thrown on them by their social superiors. And so far as the tradition was non-literary, the upper classes again took the lion's share, for the majority of the inscriptions come from the privileged powerful and cultured class.

The discoveries of papyri have made good this deficiency in a most unexpected manner. Though they, too, throw a flood of light on the upper, cultivated class, yet in innumerable cases these scraps of papyrus are records of the middle and lower

classes. They possess for the study of antiquity the same eminent degree of importance as that sandhill we imagined just now—alas that it is undiscoverable!—would possess for our own earlier history if it contained original letters of the tenth century.

It is owing to the Egyptian climate that such mounds exist beside the Nile. On the outskirts of ancient Egyptian towns and villages there were, as in our towns, places where rubbish and refuse might be deposited. Whole bundles of old time-expired official documents, instead of being burnt or otherwise destroyed, were cast out by the authorities on these rubbish heaps. Private persons did the same when clearing out their accumulations of old and

therefore worthless written matter. The reverence of mankind in antiquity for writing of any kind may have been a reason for rejecting the more convenient method of destruction by fire. The centuries have covered these rubbish heaps with thick layers of dust and sand, which, in conjunction with the dryness of the climate, have preserved even papyrus most admirably.

Egyptian peasants, digging in these mounds for earth to manure their fields with, were the first chance discoverers of ancient papyri. The news of such discoveries first reached Europe in the eighteenth century ; the nineteenth witnessed the gradual arrival here and there of a small number of papyri in the European museums. There they were looked

upon as curiosities until in the last quarter of the century the great and astounding discoveries began.

These discoveries immediately led to systematic searches, and even excavations ; and here it is chiefly British investigators who have done the greatest service in enlarging and publishing our store of papyri. Flinders Petrie ¹ has recovered magnificent old specimens, particularly from mummy-wrappings, which were made by sticking sheets of papyrus together. Grenfell and Hunt,² the Dioscuri of research, have

¹ Cf. J. P. Mahaffy, *On the Flinders Petrie Papyri*. With transcriptions, commentaries, and index. Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, 1891, vol. ii. 1893.

² By B. P. Grenfell :—*An Alexandrian Erotic Fragment, and other Greek Papyri, chiefly Ptolemaic*, Oxford, 1896. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt :—*New Classical Fragments, and other Greek and Latin*

carried out epoch-making excavations at Oxyrhynchus and other places, and have published their treasures with astonishing promptitude and masterly accuracy.

Thus during the last twenty years a new science, Papyrology, has grown up and has undergone division into numerous branches according to the various languages in which the documents are written. The oldest documents, going back to more than 2500 B.C., fall within the province of Egyptology. There are also Aramaic papyri,

Papyri, Oxford, 1897. *Λόγια Ἰησοῦ* . . . From an early Greek Papyrus, London, 1897. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London, 1898-1907. *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri* (with D. G. Hogarth), London, 1900. *The Amherst Papyri*, London, 1900-1. *The Tebtunis Papyri*, London, 1902-7. *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, London, 1904. *The Hibeh Papyri*, London, 1906. *Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, London, 1907.

and great interest has been aroused by those of the fifth century B.C., which were recently published by Sayce and Cowley,¹ and supplemented still more recently by the texts deciphered by Sachau.²

With the fourth century B.C. begins the main body of the papyri. Greek documents, of the most various contents, they run through the whole Ptolemaic period—i.e., for us the period of the origin of the Greek Old Testament; they run on through the earliest Imperial period—i.e., for us the period of the origin of the New Testament;

¹ A. H. Sayce and A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri discovered at Assuan*. With appendices by W. Spiegelberg and Seymour de Ricci. London, 1906 (pp. 79; 27 plates).

² Eduard Sachau, *Drei aramäische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine* (Abhandlungen der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1907). Berlin, 1907 (pp. 46, 1 plate).

they continue from the second to the fourth century, A.D.—i.e., for us the age of the persecutions ; and finally they extend over another five hundred years of Christian Byzantine civilization. Together with them are found also a number of Latin papyri ; in the later periods numerous fragments in Coptic, Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, and other languages.

The great published collections of these treasures confront us like some high mountain that has just been discovered, and from whose summit we shall be able to see farther than ever our ancestors could ; but we have not yet climbed one tenth part of the ascent. Papyrological students have found a rallying-point in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, a journal founded by the

greatest of German papyrologists, Ulrich Wilcken.¹

Students of the Greek Bible are indebted principally to the Greek papyri for additions to their knowledge. There are of course numerous fragments of Biblical and early Christian manuscripts, but of these I do not intend to speak here. I am concerned with the non-Christian texts. They are not a uniform group. Side by side with documents of the lower and middle class we find also—and in the pre-Christian period find most commonly—official texts written in official style and in the unvarying language of legal formularies. Even these afford us deep insight into the civilization of their time. But freshest and most direct in their

¹ *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, hrsg. von U. Wilcken, Leipzig, 1900, etc.

appeal are those written in the colloquial language, often in the crudest of vulgar Greek. Here truly are the great store-rooms from which Biblical philology draws its new knowledge.

Still more “vulgar” are the texts newly discovered on the *Ostraca*. The ostrakon or potsherd, obtainable from any broken jug or vessel, was the writing material of the poor, a favourite even with the authorities in their dealings with the poorer classes, and used especially often for tax-receipts. Formerly almost unnoticed and even despised by investigators, the ostraca have now attained a place of honour—thanks especially to the labours of Wilcken¹ on the

¹ U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1899 (2 vols.).

Greek, and of Crum¹ on the Coptic ostraca—and large collections of them have been rapidly formed in the European museums. In 1819 an architect named Gau, who was working at Dakkeh in Nubia, threw away nearly all the ostraca he found there as worthless rubbish, but nowadays these little texts are properly respected. Only the dealers in antiquities have not yet learnt to set a high value on them. A short text written on an ostrakon would cost twenty times as much if it were on papyrus, though there is no difference in the historical value of its contents.

The number of Biblical fragments on

¹ *Coptic Ostraca from the collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum and others.* The texts edited with translations and commentaries by W. E. Crum, London, 1902.

ostraca is not large at present. The most important find hitherto consists of twenty ostraca from Upper Egypt, some large and some small, with fragments from the Gospels.

But the ostraca, like the papyri, possess a greater indirect value. As linguistic memorials of the lower classes these humble potsherd texts shed light on many a detail of the linguistic character of our sacred Book—that Book which was written not by learned men but by simple folk, by men who themselves confessed that they had their treasure in earthen vessels (2 Cor. iv. 7). And thus the modest ostraca rank as of equal value with the papyri and inscriptions.

In the following lectures we shall have to speak of the great changes which Biblical philology has undergone as a consequence

of the employment of these texts. But I may say here that the autograph evidence of the world contemporary with the Greek Bible helps us to understand that Bible not only linguistically, but also in other ways. The most important thing of all perhaps is that we become better acquainted with the bright and dark side of the men to whom were addressed the propaganda of cosmopolitan Graeco-Judaism and the missions of cosmopolitan Christianity, and that we thus learn to judge more justly of both the contact and the contrast in which Primitive Christianity stood with the surrounding world.

**THE PROBLEM OF “BIBLICAL”
GREEK**

II

THE PROBLEM OF "BIBLICAL" GREEK

IN our first lecture we called attention to the close connexion between the Greek Old Testament, represented by the Septuagint translation, and the Greek New Testament ; and we described the new sources for the philological investigation of the Greek Bible. To-day we are to discuss briefly the great fundamental problem of Biblical philology, the problem of the language of the Greek Bible.

The essence of the problem is indicated at once by our manner of formulating it. We are to inquire not about Biblical Greek

but about the language of the Greek Bible. This distinction is not a mere playing with words ; it points to a fundamental principle of great importance.

Most of the earlier books on the subject were devoted to the investigation not of the language of the Greek Bible but of Biblical Greek, or of a part of it, namely, New Testament Greek.

Let us glance at a few title pages. Edwin Hatch wrote *Essays in Biblical Greek*,¹ and H. A. A. Kennedy wrote on the *Sources of New Testament Greek*.² Hermann Cremer's work, even in the ninth edition, in spite of the sharp criticism it has undergone,

¹ Edwin Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford, 1889.

² H. A. A. Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek : or the Influence of the Septuagint on the Vocabulary of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1895.

remains what it was before, a “Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek.”¹ The new German revision of Winer’s Grammar appeared under the old title, *Grammar of the New Testament Idiom*,² and the late Friedrich Blass presented us with a *Grammar of New Testament Greek*.³

We even find this kind of title used by more recent scholars—Dr. J. H. Moulton,⁴ for example—but in these cases it is merely

¹ H. Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*, Gotha, 1866–8; neunte vermehrte Auflage, Gotha, 1902.

² G. B. Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*: achte Auflage, neubearbeitet von P. W. Schmiedel, Göttingen, 1894, 1897, 1898.

³ F. Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, 1896; zweite Auflage, Göttingen, 1902.

⁴ J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, based on W. F. Moulton’s edition of G. B. Winer’s Grammar*. Vol. I. Prolegomena. Edinburgh, 1906. Second edition, 1906.

a formal concession to the older phraseology. With the older scholars, however, such a form of the title indicated a distinct peculiarity of scientific method, as is proved by such pointed sentences as the following. Hatch ¹ writes, "Biblical Greek is thus a language which stands by itself." Cremer ² adopts the words of Richard Rothe: "We can indeed with good right speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is manifest to our eyes how the Divine Spirit at work in revelation always takes the language of the particular people chosen to be the recipient and makes of it a characteristic religious variety by transforming existing linguistic elements and

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

² In his Preface of 1883. The quotation is from Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, Gotha, 1863, p. 238.

existing conceptions into a shape peculiarly appropriate to that Spirit. This process is shown most clearly by the Greek of the New Testament.” And Blass, though the statements in his Grammar show, notwithstanding its title, that he afterwards altered his theoretical views on this question, remarked once in a review¹ that New Testament Greek was “to be recognized as something peculiar, obeying its own laws.”

These quotations could be increased by no small number of similar ones from other books. I believe that they are the expression of an opinion, still widely prevalent even at the present day, which, whether openly avowed or not, is far-

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1894, xix., col. 338

reaching in its effects, particularly on exegesis. The Greek Bible, or at least the New Testament, is thus separated off from the bulk of the monuments of the Greek language that have come down to us from antiquity, in just the same way as, for example, the inscriptions in the Doric dialect might be collected into a special volume or section by some one who was editing all the Greek inscriptions extant. The Bible is thus isolated because it is supposed to be written in "Biblical" Greek, and the New Testament because it is in "New Testament" Greek, in a "language," an "idiom," a "Greek," that must be sharply distinguished from the rest of what people have been so fond of calling "profane Greek." They could only

commit one more blunder by speaking of a Biblical or New Testament *dialect*. I have never met with this term in the literature of the subject, but I am sure it represents the popular conception in many quarters as to what the “ language ” of the Bible or the New Testament is.

This Greek, so people go on to argue, is outwardly, in comparison with other Greek, of unmistakable individuality, and inwardly it is uniform, subject to laws of its own, and possessing its own vocabulary. Even those words which are not to be reckoned among the specifically “ Biblical ” or “ New Testament ” words show for the most part a change of meaning that is often considerable and not infrequently is owing to the influence of the Hebrew or Semitic genius.

To sum up : the two fundamental notions most commonly met with in the older literature of the subject concerning the linguistic character of the Greek Bible are firstly the peculiarity, and secondly the uniformity of Biblical, or at least of New Testament Greek.

Those who support these two fundamental notions show more or less clearly by so doing their connexion with the earlier stages of research. The second idea in particular, that of the uniformity of Biblical Greek, is very old—as old as the earliest scientific speculation about the language of the Greek Bible. In the controversy of the Purists and Hebraists in the seventeenth century it was never for one moment questioned ; it was a

postulate for the theories of both parties.

And it is historically not difficult to understand ; it is the simple consequence of the mechanically conceived doctrine of inspiration as applied to the New Testament. The extension of the idea to the Greek Old Testament, which is no doubt of recent date, probably originated in an equally simple backward inference from the New Testament. The idea, once established, was supported by the concept, also quite logical in its way, of what is Biblical in the literary sense, the concept of what is Canonical.

But how does this doctrine of the peculiar and uniform nature of Biblical Greek square with the facts ? One thing seems

clear to me from the outset: it is, to say the least, incautious to make this doctrine the starting-point of research.

And if we have given up the theory of mechanical inspiration, a glance at the history of the growth of the Greek Bible in its separate parts will make us still more distrustful. For this history shows us the possibility and the probability of temporal and local differentiation.

But the sacred texts themselves speak most clearly of all. They call emphatically for division on linguistic lines into two great groups—original Greek writings, and translations of Semitic originals. Any one who does not respect this boundary line soon loses his bearings, especially in criticizing the syntactical phenomena of the

Greek Bible. The boundary line, it is true, does not run in such a way that the Septuagint lies on one side and the books of the New Testament on the other. On the contrary, the sayings of Jesus in the synoptic Gospels, and perhaps more of the New Testament, must be counted with the examples of translators' Greek, while several of the so-called apocryphal books of the Old Testament, adopted by the Septuagint, go with the Greek originals.

These two groups differ very remarkably from each other in respect to their linguistic character. We might compare, for example, the Second Epistle to the Corinthians with the Greek version of Job. The original Greek writings are examples of Greek as it was really spoken ; the Greek of the

translations often shows traces of being influenced by the language of the original, and may sometimes be described as absolutely artificial, for it was not a spoken language but invented by the translators for their immediate purpose. We must not say, therefore, that this translators' Greek was so spoken by the Jews of Alexandria and Asiatics; we must not call it "Jewish Greek." The real spoken language of the Greek Jews is illustrated in the writings of Philo, who inclined rather to the use of the literary language, and in the Pauline Epistles, Jewish inscriptions and papyri, where we find more the colloquial language in its various grades.

Yet the non-Greek character of the translated books must not be exaggerated.

I myself have formerly been less reserved in expressing my opinion on this point than I should be now. The Septuagint in many of its parts is not a non-Greek book if only we take as our standard not the classical Attic of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. but the popular cosmopolitan Greek of the last three centuries B.C. Much that is non-Attic in the Septuagint is not necessarily non-Greek, but is proved by contemporary “ vulgar ” texts to be popular Greek.

We find, moreover, remarkable differences within the two main groups themselves, as was only to be expected. The translations were not made by one and the same hand, nor on a uniform method ; for example, the sayings of our Lord in the

Gospels are in general better translated than many parts of the Septuagint. How characteristic is the language of the Gospel and Epistles of St. John as compared with, say, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The Johannine Epistles are classical examples of the simplest popular language; the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits a strong leaning towards the literary language.

In the face of these facts, therefore, we cannot assume that under the Ptolemies a uniform Greek for religious purposes grew up among the Egyptian Jews, and that under Tiberius, Claudius, etc., until right into the second century, this was also the language of Christians in Syria, Asia, Achaia, and Rome. These assumptions are now seen to be fictitious.

On the contrary, if we examine historically the language of the Old and New Testaments, our decided impression can only be this: Here we have side by side linguistic elements of essentially dissimilar types; and in stating and in solving our problem there can be no other point of view to be adopted except the historical.

A good deal of the uncertainty, however, which does nevertheless undoubtedly exist on this matter, arises from people's confusing the religious with the linguistic point of view in their historical examination. From the point of view of the history of religion the sacred books, despite their want of linguistic uniformity, must be taken together as documents and memorials

of two phases of revelation that are inseparable from one another. That is beyond doubt, and no less certain is it that the thoughts, the concepts, the spirit of the Greek Old Testament and of the New Testament are related, and that they differ characteristically in their main lines from the average faith of Graeco-Roman religion. But these are considerations dictated by the history of religion ; they can play no part in the determination of a specifically Biblical or Christian Greek.

One single consideration drawn from the history of language speaks for a certain linguistic peculiarity and uniformity of the Biblical writings, though only in a formal sense. They must all be criticized as monuments of late Greek, and most of

them as monuments of non-literary Greek, and with the express reservation that “ late Greek ” does not mean something sharply defined, always recognizable at once and with precision, but something fluctuating, often problematical, something which we do not fully know, a piece of living and therefore mysterious linguistic history.

There is no formula by which to describe briefly the characteristics of late Greek, and qualitative judgments describing it as “ bad ” Greek, and so on, are either uttered by doctrinaires regardless of history or echoed from the grammarians who fancied themselves able by their authority to prevent the changes and chances of things.

Greek philologists, enslaved to the pre-

judice that only the so-called classical Greek is beautiful, have long treated the texts of the later period with the greatest contempt. A good deal of their false judgments about late Greek is the simple consequence of their complete ignorance of it. The renaissance of Greek philology in our own day, owing to the progress of Epigraphy and Papyrology, has made amends for the neglect of late Greek by the older generation of scholars. At the present day there are plenty of accurate workers engaged in investigating philologically the newly discovered specimens of cosmopolitan Greek of the period from Alexander the Great to Constantine. I will mention only the most important: Dr. Wilhelm Crönert of Göttingen (*Memoria Graeca Hercula-*

nensis) ; ¹ Dr. Karl Dieterich, of Leipzig (*Investigations on the History of the Greek Language*) ; ² Dr. Hatzidakis, the well-known Professor at Athens (*Introduction to Modern Greek Grammar*) ; ³ Dr. van Herwerden, the veteran Dutch philologist (*Lexicon Graecum Suppletorium et Dialecticum*) ; ⁴ Dr. Jannaris, the St. Andrews lecturer (*Historical Greek Grammar*) ; ⁵ Dr. Kretschmer, of Vienna (*The Origin of the*

¹ *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis. Cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniis comparatam proposuit Guilelmus Crönert.* Lipsiae, 1903.

² Karl Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahrh. n. Chr.*, Leipzig, 1898.

³ Georgios N. Hatzidakis (= Chatzidakis), *Einführung in die neugriechische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1892.

⁴ Henricus van Herwerden, *Lexicon Graecum suppletorium et dialecticum*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1902, 1904 (two parts).

⁵ Antonios N. Jannaris (= Giannares), *An Historical Greek Grammar*, London, 1897.

Koinē) ; ¹ Dr. Mayser, a Stuttgart school-master (*Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Ptolemaic Period*) ; ² Dr. Meisterhans and Dr. Schwyzer, two Swiss scholars (*Grammar of the Attic Inscriptions*) ; ³ Dr. Nachmanson, a Swede (*Phonology and Morphology of the Inscriptions of Magnesia*) ; ⁴ Dr. Wilhelm Schmid, the Tübingen Professor (*The Atticists*) ; ⁵ Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt, a Prus-

¹ Paul Kretschmer, *Die Entstehung der Koine*, Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philos.-hist. Klasse, Band cxliii., Nr. 10.

² Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Laut- und Wortlehre. Leipzig, 1906.

³ K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1885 ; zweite Auflage, Berlin, 1888 ; dritte vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage, besorgt von E. Schwyzer, Berlin, 1900.

⁴ Ernst Nachmanson, *Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften*, Upsala, 1903.

⁵ Wilhelm Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis*

sian schoolmaster (*De Flavii Iosephi elocutione*) ; ¹ Dr. Wilhelm Schulze, a member of the Berlin Academy (*Graeca Latina*) ; ² Dr. Schweizer (*Grammar of the Inscriptions of Pergamos*),³ who now calls himself “ Schwyzer ” and has been already mentioned as the reviser of Meisterhans ; Dr. Thumb of the University of Marburg (*The Greek Language in the Hellenistic Period*) ; ⁴ Dr. Wackernagel, the Göttingen

auf den zweiten Philostratus, Stuttgart, 1887-97 (5 vols.).

¹ Guilelmus Schmidt, *De Flavii Iosephi elocutione observationes criticae*, Lipsiae, 1893 ; (from Fleckeisen's Jahrbücher, Suppl. xx., pp. 345-550.

² Guilelmus Schulze, *Graeca Latina* (Einladung zur akademischen Preisverkündigung), Göttingen, 1901.

³ Eduard Schweizer, *Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften*, Berlin, 1898.

⁴ Albert Thumb, *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus : Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurtheilung der Κοινή*, Strassburg, 1901.

Professor of Comparative Philology (*Hellenistica*),¹ and other scholars.

In this renaissance of Greek philology the Greek Bible has also been regarded with new eyes. It may now be described as the central object of the investigations into late Greek. Whereas formerly the qualitative judgments, "good" or "bad," prevented the clear recognition of its linguistic character, now, owing to its being brought into vital connexion with late Greek, floods of light are being shed upon the Bible. We may say that the Greek Bible is now seen to be, in its very nature and in its influence, the noblest monument of cosmopolitan late Greek.

¹ Jacobus Wackernagel, *Hellenistica* (Einladung zur akademischen Preisverkündung), Göttingen, 1907.

This late Greek, including the original Greek of the Bible, is neither good nor bad ; it bears the stamp of its age and asserts its own distinctive position in a grand process of development in the language, which, beginning in the earliest times, has lasted down to the present day. Late Greek has stripped off much that was customary in the earlier period, and it contains germs of future developments destined to be completed in Modern Greek.

We may then speak of a certain peculiarity and uniformity in original “Bible” Greek, but solely as opposed to earlier or later phases of the history of the language, not as opposed to “profane Greek.”

The peculiarities of late Greek are most clearly discernible in the accidence. We

are now so far advanced as to have established almost completely the morphology of the popular and colloquial forms of Hellenistic Greek. And we find that there is remarkable agreement between these forms and the forms that used to be considered peculiar to New Testament or Septuagint Greek.

From the lexical point of view there is also found to be great community between the Biblical and non-Biblical Greek.

As for the syntactical and stylistic peculiarities that formerly were considered the chief reason for isolating "Biblical" Greek, they also appear now in a different light. We have come to recognize that we had greatly over-estimated the number of Hebraisms and Aramaisms in the

Bible. Many features that are non-Attic and bear some resemblance to the Semitic and were therefore regarded as Semiticisms, belong really to the great class of international vulgarisms, and are found in vulgar papyri and inscriptions as well as in the Bible.

The number of real Semiticisms is therefore smaller than was supposed, and smaller than Julius Wellhausen,¹ for example, has recently declared it to be. But not one of the recent investigators has dreamt of denying the existence of Semiticisms. They are more numerous in the Septuagint than in those parts of the New Testament that were translated from the Aramaic ;

¹ Julius Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin, 1905, p. 9 ff.

but in the original Greek texts they are very rare.

In pronouncing on them philologically a distinction must be observed that was formulated by Hermann Paul¹ in a case of the same kind : the distinction between what is occasional and what is usual. Semiticisms are "occasional," for example, if they are brought about in a translation by the accidental influence of the original from which the translation is made ; they are "usual" if, for example, they have become stereotyped in "sacred formulas" or other phrases. A certain number of these "usual" Semiticisms were moreover coined by the Septuagint, and may there-

¹ Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 3. Auflage, Halle, 1898, pp. 67, 145.

fore, as Theodor Nägeli¹ well suggested, be called Septuagintisms.

What we do deny is merely this : that the Semiticisms, particularly those of the New Testament, are sufficient reason for scholars to isolate the language of our sacred texts. Our opinion of the Biblical language is reached by considering its innumerable coincidences with the cosmopolitan language, not its numerable differences from it. The Semiticisms do not place the Bible outside the scope of Greek philology ; they are merely birthmarks. They show us that in this great cosmopolitan Book the Greek cosmopolitan language was spoken by men whose home lay in the East.

¹ Theodor Nägeli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, Göttingen, 1905, p. 74.

P.G.B.

SEPTUAGINT PHILOLOGY

III

SEPTUAGINT PHILOLOGY

OUR discussion in the second lecture on methods of studying the language of the Greek Bible may be said to result in two requirements, one for specialization of the study, the other for its incorporation as a branch in the larger complex of studies dealing with late Greek.

For future linguistic work on the Greek Bible, particularly the Septuagint, on these lines we now possess an auxiliary of more than ordinary importance in a great three-volume concordance that has recently been completed: the *Concordance to the Septua-*

gint and the other Greek Translations of the Old Testament, by Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath.¹ Apart from the "Indices" to some classical authors and concordances to the more important English poets books of this sort are really a speciality of the theological tool-basket. Originally, no doubt, they were designed to assist in practical exegesis, but they now form part of the indispensable apparatus of scientific investigation. They enable us to take a rapid survey of the uses of words, forms, and constructions, and though they may seem to be a satire on the saying that the Scripture cannot be broken, if rightly used they do indeed promote the more intimate knowledge of the Bible.

¹ Oxford, 1892-1906, 3 vols.

The chief requisites indispensable in any concordance are trustworthiness and completeness of statement. The old Septuagint Concordance by Tromm,¹ to which one was formerly obliged to have recourse, did not fulfil these requirements. It was published in 1718, and is responsible for a good deal of original sin in the quotations to be found in commentaries.

The new Concordance was prepared and begun under the auspices of Hatch, who, however, did not live to witness the publication of even the first instalment. He died, according to human reckoning, much too early, on the eleventh of November, 1889, at Oxford. I consider the preparation of

¹ Abraham Tromm, *Concordantiae Graecae versionis LXX. Interpretum*, Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1718 (2 vols., folio).

the Septuagint Concordance to have been his greatest service to learning. That monumental work is the abiding fulfilment of the simple aspiration that Hatch himself once expressed in verse :

For me . . .
To have been a link in the chain of life :
Shall be immortality.

Like all human work, it is not free from errors, but it is on the whole thoroughly trustworthy. One of its chief advances on its predecessor is shown in the attention paid to those minute words, the particles, which are of such great interest philologically. Schmiedel,¹ however, is certainly right in wishing that in the case of particles the editors had not only noted the passages but also printed them in full. It is really,

¹ Winer-Schmiedel, p. xv.

in some cases, of more importance to be able to inform oneself rapidly concerning the uses of the particle *ἀν* than to be able to trace in long lists the occurrence of such a word as *ἀνθρωπος*.

It is a defect, in my opinion, that the principle of absolute completeness has not been carried out. Thus, for example, the personal pronouns are not given, or rather they are only recorded with the addition of the word *passim*—a remark which may of course mean very much or very little. Not long ago I had occasion to examine the uses of the solemn formula “I am,” *ἐγώ εἰμι*, which occurs in the Gospel of St. John and in inscriptions relating to the cult of Isis. Here the Concordance, article *ἐγώ*, failed to assist me, for the *ἐγώ εἰμι*

which it records is something different. In this case of course it was possible to look for εἶμι in the article εἶναι ; but what is to be done when the grammarian wishes to examine the use of the emphatic ἐγώ or σὺ ?

I am unable to agree with the aggrieved complaint of Cremer,¹ to whom the statistical system followed in the Concordance seems to be a mistake. On the contrary, I consider it an advantage that we now obtain more rapid information as to the linguistic usages of the separate books. The numbers appended always will afford information as to the Hebrew original for which the Greek word stands. We must also be grateful for the notice taken of the chief

¹ *Bibl.-Theol. Wörterbuch*, 8th ed., p. xv. f.

variants in the manuscripts. Many details of importance in the history of the language are concealed in them. For example, the word *δοκίμιος*, of great importance in two places¹ in the New Testament where it was not recognized, can be established from Septuagint variants, and its occurrence is then confirmed by the papyri.

The third volume is particularly valuable. It contains a Concordance of proper names in the Septuagint and other translations which may be called epoch-making as regards the study of Semitic and Greek sounds and pronunciation. It contains further a Concordance of the parts of the Greek Ecclesiasticus where corresponding Hebrew equivalents can be given. Thirdly,

¹ Jas. i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 7.

there is new Hexaplaric material, chiefly from the discoveries of Dr. Mercati in the Vatican Library ; and finally there is an Index to the Hebrew words in the whole work.

This last index possesses an importance that has not yet been generally recognized. We knew already from the Greek Concordance that the Septuagint exhibits a striking simplification of the vocabulary of its original. One single Septuagint word serves not infrequently to translate a hundred and more different words in the Hebrew. How far this reduction of the copiousness of the Hebrew was neutralized by Hebrew words receiving a variety of Greek translations, it was hitherto, except by very troublesome work with the Hebrew

Concordance, impossible to ascertain. The Hebrew index of the Oxford Concordance has now made it possible to examine with both speed and accuracy this not unimportant question in the statistics of the language. We see that there are also Hebrew words which the translators have rendered in over a hundred different ways. The same index will also prove of excellent service for investigating the peculiarities of the individual translators.

The work is printed with simple English elegance and will remain for years and perhaps for centuries the only one of its kind. Remembering this we can only repeat with deep gratitude the words of the surviving editor, Henry A. Redpath, in his last preface, dated May, 1906, where he

describes the work as a labour of love. Truly, such a monumental work could not have been created without love and enthusiasm.

A Concordance does not pretend to be a positive advancement of philology; but it can be the stimulus to a revival of the study, for it is to the scholar the same as a large, well-arranged herbarium is to the botanist—material for research in conveniently accessible form.

Other equally important auxiliaries for students of the Septuagint are the new editions of the text. Oxford presented us with the new Concordance, and Cambridge is giving us the new text. First Henry Barclay Swete produced a highly successful manual edition of the Vatican text,¹ with

¹ *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Sep-*

the variants of the other most important manuscripts, and supplemented it with the first Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.¹ His labours are the most important that have been bestowed on the Septuagint since Lagarde's valuable work in the last third of the nineteenth century. His Introduction in particular is at once a compendium of all the earlier Septuagint philology and a stimulus for all future work on the subject.

Then the "large" Cambridge Septuagint² began to appear, Genesis being

tuagint. Edited by H. B. Swete, 3 vols., Cambridge, 1887-94; 2nd ed., 1895-1900; 3rd ed., 1901-7.

¹ *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, by H. B. Swete. Cambridge, 1900; 2nd ed., 1902.

² *The Old Testament in Greek according to the text of Codex Vaticanus*, supplemented from other uncial manuscripts, with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the

published in 1906 as the first part of the first volume. This great work was also originally under the management of Swete, but when he was obliged to relinquish the execution of the larger plan in 1895 it was entrusted to Alan England Brooke and Norman McLean. The Cambridge Septuagint does not aim at determining the primitive text—the time is not yet ripe for that—but it tries to give a collection, as complete and trustworthy as possible, of all the materials for the text, which, since the great Oxford edition of Holmes and Parsons,¹ have been greatly increased. Such a col-

text of the Septuagint. Edited by Alan E. Brooke and Norman McLean. Vol. i., Part 1., Genesis. Cambridge, 1906.

¹ R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, Oxonii, 1798–1827 (5 vols.).

lection of the materials was as necessary as daily bread to Biblical philology. I was at the Hamburg Congress of Orientalists in 1902, when Professor Nestle made the first authentic announcement concerning the forthcoming work based on an article by Brooke and McLean, and there can be no doubt that all present were impressed by the extreme importance of the matter. The Genesis which has since appeared has not disappointed our highest expectations. The editors have worked with the greatest accuracy. All the available witnesses to the text have been cited, down to the most recently published papyri, including the most important cursive manuscripts, the old translations, Philo, the New Testament, and the quotations in the old

ecclesiastical writers. The thread upon which everything is strung is usually, as in Swete's edition, the Codex Vaticanus. The typography is a masterpiece of the Cambridge University Press.

It is to be hoped that, as we now possess such splendid new auxiliaries, Biblical philology will address itself to the great task of compiling a Septuagint Lexicon. It would be quite mistaken policy to postpone work on the Lexicon till we have something like a critical text. That would be putting it off till the Greek Kalends. But we can begin at once. A Lexicon is not intended to last for centuries; it does duty only until it is relieved by a better one, and the textual critic is the last person who can afford to do without a Lexicon. Hitherto we have

had only the old Septuagint Dictionary by Biel,¹ or the revision of it by Schleusner,² which is a rather insipid adaptation of Tromm's Concordance, useless at the present day except as a collection of material. The Key to the Old Testament Apocrypha by Christian Abraham Wahl³ is better in its way, but also no longer up to the stan-

¹ Joannes Christianus Biel, *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus : sive Lexicon in LXX. et alios interpretes et scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. Ex Biellii autoris manuscripto edidit ac praefatus est E. H. Mutzenbecher. Hagae Comitum, 1779-80 (3 parts).

² Johann Friedrich Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus : sive Lexicon in LXX. et reliquos interpretes Graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti*. Post Bielium et alios viros doctos con-gessit et edidit J. F. Schleusner. Lipsiae, 1820-1 (5 parts); editio altera, locupletata, Londini, 1829 (3 vols.).

Lexici in Interpretes Graecos Veteris Testamenti, maxime Scriptores Apocryphos spicilegium. Post Bielium con-gessit et edidit J. F. Schleusner. Lipsiae, 1784-6 (2 vols.).

³ C. A. Wahl, *Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum philologica*, Lipsiae, 1853.

dard of modern requirements. Particularly for the Septuagint Lexicon the inscriptions and papyri are of the very greatest importance.

Recent years have produced only preliminary studies for the future lexicon. Those contributed by Hermann Cremer in his *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*¹ must on no account be forgotten. Yet I cannot help feeling that partly at least they are influenced by the belief in "Biblical" Greek, and I consider critical revision to be imperative. The same applies to the lexical work in Hatch's *Essays in Biblical Greek*,² which are full of fine observations. H. A. A. Ken-

¹ See above, p. 41, n. 1.

² See above, p. 40, n. 1.

nedy, in his *Sources of New Testament Greek*,¹ a book which is unfortunately not always correct in its detailed statements, supplies many correct illustrations of the vocabulary of the Septuagint, and afterwards of the New Testament, from contemporary Greek sources. A gratifying piece of work in the form of a doctoral dissertation was published at Halle in 1894 by Heinrich Anz,² investigating the relation of two hundred and eighty-nine verbs in the Pentateuch with the popular language. The conception of "Biblical" Greek, which might so easily have been an . . obstacle to the work, obviously causes

¹ See above, p. 40, n. 2.

² Heinrich Anz, *Subsidia ad cognoscendum Graecorum sermonem vulgarem e Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina repetita*. Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses, vol. XII., Halis Sax., 1894.

the author few misgivings. He takes the Book of the Seventy frankly for what it is and what it claims to be, and treats it as a specimen of popular Greek. His investigations into the history of the words selected impress one as thoroughly sound, and may be regarded as preliminary studies for the Septuagint Dictionary. It is a pity that the more recent papyrus discoveries were not then accessible to the author.

In 1897 and 1899 the Professor of Theology at Utrecht, J. M. S. Baljon,¹ published a Dictionary of Early Christian Literature, which as regards the New Testament articles was founded on Cremer. It professes to contain the vocabulary of the

¹ J. M. S. Baljon, *Grieksch-theologisch Woordenboek hoofdzakelijk van de oud-christelijke letterkunde*, Utrecht, 1895-9 (2 parts).

Septuagint and its satellites, besides that of the New Testament and of Early Christian literature in general. The idea of constructing a common dictionary for the whole of this large field is undoubtedly a good one, but one cannot help suspecting that the idea is *too* great for the present time. A lexicon, whether to the Septuagint or to the New Testament, cannot be constructed off-hand, if it is to contain what we have a right nowadays to expect. Blass criticized the book¹ and found in it not a little that a philologist could not approve. With all admiration for Baljon's industry it must nevertheless be said that he does not even touch, much less solve, the really great problems of a Septuagint Dictionary.

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, xxii. col. 43 f.

In 1895 a Cambridge committee drew up a plan for a Dictionary of the Septuagint, but Swete some time ago informed us that the plan had been suspended for the present. This is highly regrettable, but the reasons for the suspension are intelligible to any one who knows the present position of research. The difficulties are very great, and those peculiar to a Septuagint Dictionary are commonly underestimated. People think that the problem is solved by ascertaining what Hebrew word or words are represented by the Septuagint word. They then look up the meaning of the Hebrew and thus obtain what they consider the "meaning" of the Septuagint word. Equivalence of the words—an obvious fact, easily ascertainable—is taken without further ado

to denote equivalence in the ideas conveyed.

People forget that the Septuagint has often substituted words of its own rather than translated. All translation, in fact, implies some, if only a slight, alteration of the sense of the original. The meaning of a Septuagint word cannot be deduced from the original which it translates or replaces but only from other remains of the Greek language, especially from those Egyptian sources that have lately flowed so abundantly. Even Professor Blass, I am glad to say, took up this position at last—a position which, unfortunately, is not conceded at once, but has to be slowly won by combat with an unmethodical school.

To give one example: Baljon in his Lexicon gives as meanings for the Septua-

gint word ἄρκευθος “olive tree” and “cypress tree.” The Hebrew words for these two trees are certainly sometimes rendered ἄρκευθος by the translators, and so Baljon concludes that in the language of the Septuagint ἄρκευθος had these meanings. No, says Blass¹ very truly, ἄρκευθος means “juniper,” and “a wrong translation does not turn the juniper into an olive or a cypress.” There can be no doubt about that.

I can perhaps make my point clearer by an analogy. In the English Authorized Version the “terebinth” of the original is usually translated “oak” (Isa. i. 29; Gen. xxxv. 4). On the analogy of Baljon’s article a Dictionary of the Authorized

¹ Col. 44.

Version would have to say that "oak" meant "terebinth," whereas the truth of the matter is that the English translators, like Luther in the German translation, have rendered the Hebrew—I will not say wrongly, but—inexactly. They have Anglicized and Luther has Germanized the Oriental tree.

In the case of Septuagint words of importance in the history of religion the unhappy confusing influence of the mechanical equating process is shown still more clearly ; the apparent and external equivalence of words is made the basis of far-reaching deductions. Even a Septuagint scholar like Eberhard Nestle, whose scattered notes are usually most instructive, does not keep altogether clear of this method.

As an example to illustrate this whole subject I may mention the word *ἱλαστήριον*. You will read of this word in many respectable books on theology that in Septuagint Greek or in "Biblical" Greek it "means" "the lid of the ark of the covenant," because the corresponding Hebrew word "kapporeth" is in most cases so translated by modern scholars. Now the etymology of the word, confirmed by certain inscriptions, shows that *ἱλαστήριον* means "object of expiation or propitiation." In choosing the word *ἱλαστήριον* to denote the lid of the ark of the covenant the Septuagint has not translated the concept of "lid" but has replaced it by another concept which brings out the sacred purpose of the ark. The lid of the ark of the

covenant is an *ἱλαστήριον*, but it does not follow that *ἱλαστήριον* means "lid" either in the Septuagint, in St. Paul, or anywhere else; it can only mean "expiatory or propiatory object."

A large proportion of the so-called "Biblical" meanings of words common to all forms of the Greek language owe their existence in the dictionaries solely to this mechanical equating process. In order to effect such comparisons of words there is no need of a lexicon at all; the concordance is sufficient. The lexicon has very different and much more complicated tasks before it. It must exhibit the Greek word in the history of its uses, availing itself specially of the linguistic remains that are locally and temporally most appro-

priate. It must try to discover and explain the discrepancies of meaning between words equated with one another by the comparative method.

This task is as profitable as it is vast. It will be discovered that the translators, despite their reverence for the syntactical peculiarities of their original, have made liberal use of their own everyday vocabulary, especially in the case of technical and expressive phrases. This has been shown in an instructive essay by B. Jacob¹ on the Book of Esther. Various details will be found in the writings of Jean Antoine Letronne² and Giacomo Lum-

¹ B. Jacob, *Das Buch Esther bei den LXX.*, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1890, x. p. 241 ff.

² J. A. Letronne, *Recherches pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte pendant la domination des Grecs et des*

broso¹ on Egyptian history under the Ptolemies, and in the still valuable work of H. W. J. Thiersch on the Greek Pentateuch.²

As examples of the Egyptianizing and, from their point of view, modernizing tendency of the translators, I may quote the following. In the book of Esther (ii. 21) certain officials are mentioned who bear the title of “keepers of the thresh-

Romains, tirées des inscriptions grecques et latines, relatives à la chronologie, à l'état des arts, aux usages civils et religieux de ce pays. Paris, 1823.—*Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de l'Égypte*, étudiées dans leur rapport avec l'histoire politique, l'administration intérieure, les institutions civiles et religieuses de ce pays, depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à celle des Arabes. Paris, 1842-8.

¹ G. Lumbroso, *L'Egitto dei Greci e dei Romani*; seconda edizione . . . accresciuta di un'appendice bibliografica. Roma, 1895.—*Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Turin, 1870.

² Heinrich Wilhelm Josias Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina libri tres*. Erlangae, 1840.

old." The Septuagint renders this title by ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ, that is "chief of the body-guard," a designation that occurs in Egyptian inscriptions and papyri¹ as the title of an official in the court of the Ptolemies.

In Joel i. 20, describing the distress of the land, it is said that the rivers of waters are dried up. The Egyptian translators have turned the "rivers of waters" into "canals," thus making the description much more life-like to Egyptian readers.

In Genesis l. 2 ff. it is written that the physicians embalmed the body of Jacob. The Septuagint says ἐνταφιασταί instead of "physicians" (ἰατροί), for ἐνταφιαστής, as we know from a papyrus² of the first

¹ Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 2nd ed., p. 98.

² Ibid., p. 120 f.

century B.C., was the technical term for members of the guild that looked after embalming.

Thiersch's little book, already mentioned, consists chiefly of grammatical studies of the translation of the Pentateuch. It is in every respect a most excellent performance, and was in many points decidedly in advance of its times. Unfortunately, for a long period Thiersch had practically no followers. Purely grammatical investigations of the Septuagint were altogether wanting except what was now and then contained in Grammars of the New Testament, especially Schmiedel's.¹ The spell was broken by Swete in his Introduction.² His fourth

¹ See above, p. 41, n. 2.

² See above, p. 79, n. 1.

chapter, containing an account of the Greek of the Septuagint, includes an outline of the grammar; another is given by Conybeare and Stock¹ in their *Selections from the Septuagint*, which will be referred to again presently. A larger Septuagint Grammar is announced as in preparation by Thackeray, the editor of the Epistle of Aristeas in Swete's Introduction.

In the autumn of 1907 there was published, after years of preliminary labour, a German Septuagint Grammar by R. Helbing,² closely in touch with the recent developments of Greek philology, and based upon an exact study of the enormous

¹ See below, p. 101, n. 2.

² Robert Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta Laut- und Wortlehre*, Göttingen, 1907.

materials drawn from the three parallel sources—inscriptions, papyri, and late authors. The extent of the material furnished merely by the papyri of the Ptolemaic age, contemporary with the Septuagint, may be judged from the highly meritorious *Grammar of Greek Papyri of the Ptolemaic Epoch* recently published by Edwin Mayser,¹ who, like Helbing, has turned his attention in the first place to the Phonology and Accidence. The syntactical problems will be treated in separate volumes by both scholars.

The exegesis of the Septuagint forms by itself a special department of Septuagint philology. Its aim is to interpret the Greek Old Testament as the *Greek Bible*. The

¹ See above, p. 58, n. 2.

Seventy represented a Hellenization of Semitic monotheism on a great scale, and their work became a force in literature and in the history of religion, just like Luther's Bible in later times. But, apart from commentaries on the Old Testament by ancient fathers of the Church, exegetical works on the Septuagint compiled in earlier times are unknown. Such work was neglected probably because the Septuagint was generally used simply as a means for the reconstruction of the Hebrew original text, and because the few who were interested in the contents of the book for its own sake were much too strongly inclined to believe that the sense of the Greek text was one and the same with that of the Semitic original. In countless instances, however,

the sense of the two texts does not coincide—and then is the time for Septuagint exegesis to step in: it is a fine large field, and until lately was quite unworked.

Three beginnings have recently been made: one by R. R. Ottley in his *Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint*¹; the second by F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, who in their *Selections from the Septuagint*² have provided a series of stories from the historical books of the Septuagint with a detailed introduction and exegetical notes; and the third by F. W. Mozley, who wrote a commentary

¹ *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus.* Translated and edited by R. R. Ottley. With a parallel version from the Hebrew. Cambridge, 1904, 1906. (2 vols.)

² *Selections from the Septuagint according to the text of Swete.* Boston (U.S.A.) and London [1905]. (Ginn & Co.'s College Series of Greek Authors.)

on the Septuagint Psalms.¹ The English translation of the Septuagint by Charles Thomson,² which I have not yet seen

¹ *The Psalter of the Church*, Cambridge, 1905.

² [Translator's Note]. Charles Thomson (1719-1824) was Secretary to Congress, United States of America. His translation of the Septuagint was printed at Philadelphia, 1808, and was apparently the first English version of the Old Testament made from the Greek. It has recently been reprinted: "The Old Covenant, commonly called the Old Testament: translated from the Septuagint. By Charles Thomson. A new edition by S. F. Pells," London (Skeffington), 1904 (2 vols.). A "second issue," with the introductory matter increased from thirty-four to sixty-two pages was "published by the Editor, Hove, England, 1907." Stamped on the cover of each volume are the words: "The Septuagint. The Bible used by our Saviour and the Apostles. Used in the Christian Church for a thousand years." In the Editor's preface we read (p. xi.): "It was out of this version that our Saviour was taught when a child, and out of which He read in the synagogue the things concerning Himself (Luke iv. 18, 19)." A similar statement is repeated in the second issue, p. li.: "The language of Christianity in Palestine was Greek, and the language of the Synagogue was Greek. When our Saviour 'stood up for to read' in the synagogue of Nazareth, it was from the Greek Septuagint, Luke iv. 16-21 (not Hebrew); the ordinary speech of the country at this period was Aramaic, or Syriac." The inscription on the covers

myself, ought to be mentioned here, although the assertion in the preface to the new edition that the Septuagint was the Bible used by Christ is not correct.

The Bible that our Lord used was a Semitic Bible. Paul, however, a child of Hellenized Judaism, used the Septuagint, and with him and after him Greek Christianity, before ever there was a New Testament,

of the second issue is altered to read: "Used in the *Churches of England* for a thousand years," it being a fond delusion of Mr. Pells that the Bibles in use before the Reformation were derived from the Septuagint and therefore more authentic than our present translation from the Massoretic text!

Other English translations of the Septuagint are:—

(1) *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, according to the Vatican text*, translated into English, with the principal various readings of the Alexandrine copy, and a table of comparative chronology. By Sir L. C. L. Brènton. London, 1844 (2 vols.).

(2) *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, with an English translation: and with various readings and critical notes*. London (S. Bagster), [1870]. Reissue, 1879, pp. vi., 1130 + 4 pp. Appendix; Apocrypha paged separately, iv. 248.

reverenced the Septuagint as the Bible and made it more and more a possession of its own. It has served the Christian Church of Anatolia in unbroken continuity down to the present day. It is peculiarly moving to a Bible student of our own day when, in a remote island of the Cyclades, he passes from the glaring noonday sunshine into the darkness of a little Greek chapel and finds the intercessory prayers of the Septuagint Psalms still as living on the lips of a Greek priest as they were two thousand years ago in the synagogues of Alexandria and Delos.

One who has experienced that will return with new devotion to the Book of the Seventy, strengthened in the conviction that this monument of a world-wide religion

is indeed worthy of thorough and profound investigation on all sides, not only because of its Hebrew original but also for its own sake.

NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY

IV

NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY

WE concluded our third lecture with a short mention of the beginnings that are just being made in the exegesis of the Greek Old Testament. The exegesis of the Greek *New* Testament can look back upon a history of many centuries. The fact, however, that the New Testament as distinguished from the Greek Old Testament possesses an international exegetical literature of its own which promises soon to attain unmanageable dimensions, is not necessarily a proof of a revival of interest

in its philological investigation. The more recent commentaries, indeed, leave much to be desired from the philological point of view.

How greatly the exegesis of the New Testament is able to profit by the progress of classical archaeology in the widest sense is shown by the writings of Sir William Ramsay,¹ the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans by Hans Lietzmann,² the Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew by Th. Zahn³ and by W. C. Allen,⁴ and the excellent Commentary on

¹ See above, p. 21, n.

² Hans Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. iii., pp. 1-80, Tübingen, 1906.

³ Theodor Zahn, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, vol. i., Leipzig, 1903; zweite Auflage, 1905.

⁴ W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*. Edinburgh, 1907. (The International Critical Commentary.)

St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians by George Milligan.¹

Any further discussion of the enormous output of Commentaries in the last few years is beyond our present scope. Nor is this the occasion to review the work accomplished in New Testament textual criticism, important as it is to the New Testament philologist and tempting as it would be to speak of it here in Cambridge, where great traditions in textual criticism have been inherited and made greater by men and women of distinguished learning.

We may, however, mention in the first place as a book of great value to the New Testament philologist the Concordance to the New Testament by W. F. Moulton and

¹ London, 1908.

A. S. Geden.¹ A revised edition of an older work, the excellent Concordance of Bruder,² is also being prepared by Schmiedel.

But the most remarkable fact that strikes us on reviewing recent work is that, after a long period of stagnation in the grammatical department, we have had in the last twelve years three new Grammars of the New Testament, by Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, Friedrich Blass, and James Hope Moulton, and that the publication

¹ *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the text of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers.* Edited by Rev. W. F. Moulton and Rev. A. S. Geden. Edinburgh, 1897.

² Ταμιεῖον τῶν τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης λέξεων sive Concordantiae omnium vocum Novi Testamenti Graeci, primum ab Erasmo Schmidio editae, nunc secundum critices et hermeneutices nostrae aetatis rationes emendatae, auctae, meliori ordine dispositae cura C. H. Bruder, Lipsiae, 1842; editio stereotypa quarta, Lipsiae, 1888, sexta 1904.

of a fourth, by Ludwig Radermacher, is impending.

Schmiedel's book claims only to be a revised edition (the eighth) of G. B. Winer's Grammar.¹ The old Winer, when first published, was a protest of the philological conscience against the caprices of an arrogant empiricism. For half a century it exercised a decisive influence on exegetical work—which is a long time for any Grammar, and for a Greek Grammar in the nineteenth century a very long time indeed. While most warmly appreciating its merits we may yet say, without prejudice to the truth, that it has had its day. If you use the old edition of Winer now—and it is still to some extent indispensable—it is

¹ See above, p. 41, n. 2.

possible to find yourself thinking that what was once its strength constitutes also the weakness of the book. And I believe the feeling is not without foundation. Often you feel that something is represented as regular where there is no such thing as regularity, or uniform where the characteristic individuality of the single fact calls for recognition. In short you receive too much the impression of a "New Testament idiom" as a sharply defined magnitude in the history of the Greek language.

If in speaking of Schmiedel's new Winer I may be allowed to begin with an objection, it is a fault, so it seems to me, that there is still too much Winer and too little Schmiedel in the book. This applies, however, only to the introductory paragraphs, where

Schmiedel has allowed much to remain that is afterwards tacitly contradicted by his own statements. On the whole the new edition—or new book, as it is really—marks a characteristic and decisive turning point in New Testament philology. The phenomena of the language of the New Testament are exhibited conscientiously, and as a rule adequately, in relation with the history of the Greek language. The sources accessible to Schmiedel, especially the inscriptions and papyri, are made exhaustive use of. Unfortunately the majority of the papyrus discoveries did not come until after the appearance of Schmiedel's *Accidence* in 1894. Such preliminary studies as existed for the philologist were used by Schmiedel, and, sad

to say, there were not many. All the more must we admire the industry, the faithfulness in detail, and the eye for the great connexions traceable in the history of language, to which the book bears witness. Schmiedel's minute accuracy is well known. It does one's heart good in this false world to meet with such trustworthy quotations.

It is a pity that Schmiedel has not yet been able to complete the work ; but as a splendid Greek scholar, Eduard Schwyzer of Zürich, the grammarian of the Pergamos inscriptions, has been recently engaged as a collaborator, it may be hoped that "Winer and Schmiedel" will not have to remain a torso much longer.

In his review ¹ of Schmiedel's *Accidence*

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1894, xix. col. 532-4.

Friedrich Blass was not so warm as he might have been in acknowledging the merits of the work. In his own Grammar,¹ however, he openly acknowledges that he owed very much to Schmiedel.

And, indeed, without Schmiedel's book Blass's Grammar would not have been possible. In the review mentioned Blass observed that the gulf between theology and philology was noticeable here and there in Schmiedel, and by saying so invited the use of the same standard on his own Grammar. Now in my opinion the separation between theology and philology is altogether without justification in this field of research, and the controversy that

¹ See above, p. 41, n. 3. Translated into English by H. St. J. Thackeray, London, 1898 ; 2nd ed., 1905.

occasionally flares up is most regrettable. But as things are at present, the professed Greek scholar who takes up the study of the Bible has generally the advantage of a larger knowledge of the non-Biblical sources of the language, while the theologian is better acquainted with the Biblical texts and their exegetical problems. Prejudiced though it may sound to say so, my impression on comparing the two Grammars was that Schmiedel's defects in philology were slighter than those of Blass in theology. To speak in the language of mankind that knows no Faculties, as regards the positive interpretation of the texts of the New Testament Schmiedel is the more stimulating, so far as can be judged from the first instalment of his Syntax.

A Grammar must not be wanting in cheerful willingness to leave some things undecided. It must be seriously recognized and admitted that there are such things as open questions. That Blass theoretically held this view is shown by the following chance remark in his Grammar.¹ "The kind of relation subsisting between the genitive and its noun can only be recognized from the sense and context; and in the New Testament this is often solely a matter of theological interpretation, which cannot be taught in a Grammar." But this principle, so extremely important methodologically, is not always followed. In passages where it is certain that the phraseology is peculiar, and where the exegetical possi-

¹ Zweite Auflage, p. 97, § 35, 1.

bilities are equal, Blass often comes and smooths away with his grammatical plane something that seems like an irregularity but is really not so.

Beginners in exegesis are apt to content themselves with what they find by help of the index of texts in Blass. That is certainly not at all what Blass intended, but it is probably the consequence of what must be complained of as the theological deficiency of the book. A Grammar, especially when it bears the name of a famous philologist, is easily regarded by the average person who uses it as a compendium of all that is reducible to fixed laws and therefore as absolutely dependable. If Blass could have brought himself to rouse up energetically this easy-going deference of the youth-

ful reader, as he might have done in many parts of the Syntax, his book would have gained decidedly in value as a book for students.

I count it as one of the excellencies of the book that in the introduction the author adopts a definitive attitude on the question of "New Testament" Greek. In spite of the title, and in spite of some occasional relapses (which must not be regarded too seriously) to the method formerly championed by Blass, it is made plain that there is no such thing as a special "New Testament" Greek, and that therefore the claim of the New Testament to have a special grammar of its own can only be based on the practical needs of Bible study. As was only to be expected

from Blass, the book contains many fine observations in the details. The Syntax, however, is decidedly the weakest part of the book. The comparatively small number of examples from secular sources is particularly striking there. On the other hand—and this undoubtedly deserves our thankful attention—Blass makes ample use of the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Clementine literature. This is putting into practice the excellent remark in his grimly humorous dedication to August Fick, where he writes: “The isolation of the New Testament is a bad thing for the interpretation of it, and must be broken down as much as possible.”

In very different fashion the latest of

the grammarians, James Hope Moulton,¹ has broken down the isolation of the New Testament. He introduces himself modestly as inheritor of the work of his late father, W. F. Moulton, whose English edition of Winer's Grammar² had for almost forty years favourably influenced exegetical studies in England and America. His aged mother, who compiled the copious index of texts for him as she had done forty years before for her husband, may symbolize to us the personal continuity between the elder and the younger generation of grammarians. The son has inherited firstly the scholar's instinct for research, united with fervent love of the New Testament.

¹ See above, p. 41, n. 4.

² Edinburgh, 1870.

He has further inherited the solid foundation of the book itself, Winer and Moulton's Grammar. But he was also equipped with a modern training in Greek, and by his own industry he has created on that foundation an entirely new book. In the second edition, therefore, which was called for within a few months, the title has rightly been simplified.¹ The first volume bears the descriptive title of *Prolegomena*; a second volume, containing the grammar proper, is yet to follow. With intentional avoidance of systematic severity and concision the nine chapters of the *Prolegomena* aim at making clear by a selection of especially striking linguistic phenomena

¹ *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton, vol. i., *Prolegomena*, Edinburgh, 1906.

the general character of the Hellenistic cosmopolitan language and the position of the New Testament in the history of that language. These chapters are partly based on earlier publications of the author's in the *Expositor*, and his articles in the *Classical Review* are also made use of. What the learned doctinaire may carp at as a fault in the character of the first volume is for the reader, and especially for the young reader, a great advantage. The opinion that a Grammar can only be good if it is dull, is completely refuted by these Prolegomena. You can really read Moulton. You are not stifled in the close air of exegetical controversy, and you are not overwhelmed in a flood of quotations. The main facts and the main questions are

always seen distinctly and formulated clearly. It is an important work, in many points stimulating to research, and it should leave one great conviction behind it, namely, that the New Testament, from the linguistic point of view, stands in most vital connexion with the Hellenistic world surrounding it. The earlier grammatical treatment of our sacred Book was above all dominated by a sense of its *contrast* with the surrounding world, and the new method, conceived and followed more energetically by Moulton than by Schmiedel and Blass, emphasizes above all the *contact* with the surrounding world. The last word has not yet been said about the proportion of Semiticisms. A large number of misconceptions in earlier exegetists come from

failure to notice the fact that the speech of the people in Greek and in non-Greek languages had many points in common. Thus many phrases which strike both the classical Greek scholar with his public school and university training and the divinity Hebrew scholar, and which they triumphantly brand as Semiticisms, are not always Semiticisms, but often international vulgarisms, which do not justify the isolation of "New Testament" philology.

Excellent indices—only the Greek one is too modest—afford a convenient summary of the results of the Prolegomena. The list of papyri and inscriptions quoted shows the author's wide reading and makes it possible to use the New Testament as a source for the study of papyri and epigraphy.

The accuracy of the printing and the beautiful get-up of the book are very pleasing. The only thing that caused me misgivings was the praise given to a German scholar who had lighted by chance upon the papyri and there seen what of course would have been seen by anybody else.

It is to be hoped that the publication of these three great works, to be followed, as already mentioned, by a fourth, does not mean that the grammatical study of the New Testament will come to a standstill for a time. There are plenty of detached problems, both in accidence and syntax ; for example, it seems to me that a close examination of the syntax of the prepositions and cases, especially in St. Paul, would be particularly desirable and fruitful.

In his inaugural lecture at Manchester two years ago on "The Science of Language and the Study of the New Testament,"¹ Moulton gave a short sketch of the present state of New Testament problems.

Edwin A. Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*,² a special Grammar of the writings of St. John, which appeared recently, is a work of great merit. I have not yet been able to examine this book, nor the same author's *Johannine Vocabulary*,³ but I can rely upon the opinion of Dr. Moulton, who praises the book highly and would only have liked to see in it a closer acquaintance with the facts of late Greek.

¹ Manchester, 1906, p. 32.

² E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, London, 1906.

³ E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*: a comparison of the words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the three. London, 1905.

Two detached investigations, not, however, purely grammatical, are contained in two Heidelberg dissertations presented for the licentiate in theology, by Arnold Steubing¹ on the Pauline concept of "sufferings of Christ," and by Adolph Schettler² on the Pauline formula "through Christ." The latter especially is very instructive, and by proving that St. Paul in that formula always means the risen Lord constitutes a great simplification and deepening of our conception of the personal religion of St. Paul.

An American book from the earlier years of the modern period of research, Ernest

¹ Arnold Steubing, *Der paulinische Begriff "Christusleiden,"* Darmstadt, 1905.

² Adolph Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel "Durch Christus,"* Tübingen, 1907.

de Witt Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*,¹ deserves honourable mention, while the two very detailed grammatical works of the French Abbé, Joseph Viteau,² entitled *Études sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament*, must be used with great caution. Burton's book has moreover been recently translated into Dutch by J. de Zwaan,³ a Dutchman, who enriched it with good additions of his own. As a proof that also the Roman Catholic

¹ E. de Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 1893; 2nd ed., London (Isbister), 1893; 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1898.

² Joseph Viteau, *Études sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament*. Le Verbe: Syntaxe des Propositions. (Thèse.) Paris, 1893.—*Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui des Septante*: Sujet, Complément et Attribut. Paris, 1896. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 114).

³ J. de Zwaan, *Syntaxis der Wijzen en Tijden in het Grieksche Nieuwe Testament . . .*, Haarlem, 1906.

Church in German lands is at least not wanting in good will to assist in the grammatical work I may mention two "Programms" by Alois Theimer,¹ an Austrian schoolmaster, on the prepositions in the historical books of the New Testament.

The greatest task for the philologist of the New Testament is again a Dictionary. Excellent in the main as was Wilibald Grimm's revision ² of Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica* (as may be seen

¹ *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauches im Neuen Testamente*, Programm, Horn in Niederösterreich, 1896 and 1901.

² C. G. Wilke, *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*, Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1841, 2 vols.; another, Roman Catholic edition, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti*, by V. Loch, Ratisbonae, 1858; another Protestant edition by C. L. W. Grimm, Lipsiae, 1868, vierte Auflage, 1903; translated by J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1886; New York, 1887.

especially in the much more correct English edition by Joseph Henry Thayer), and much as Cremer's *Lexicon* has improved in the course of years, both these works, Grimm and Cremer, to say nothing of others, are no longer adequate. We now have the right to expect of a Dictionary that it shall take account of the results of modern philology, and that it therefore in particular shall not ignore the splendid additions to our knowledge due to the discoveries of the last twenty or thirty years. As far as the inscriptions are concerned, both Grimm and Cremer might have derived much information from them, and it is regrettable that they did not do so. Already a large number of words formerly considered "Biblical" or "New

Testament ” can be struck off the list on the authority of inscriptions, papyri, or passages in authors that had escaped notice.

It used to be a favourite amusement of the older lexicographers to distinguish words as specifically Biblical or New Testament, and the number of such words has been enormously overestimated. Even Kennedy ¹ calculates, from the lists in Thayer’s Lexicon, that among the 4,800 to 5,000 words used in the New Testament (omitting proper names), about 550 are “ Biblical,” that is, words “ found either in the New Testament alone, or, besides, only in the Septuagint. That is, about twelve per cent. of the total vocabulary of the New Testa-

¹ P. 93. See above, p. 40, n. 2

ment is 'Biblical.' " But this estimate will not bear close examination.

Many of these 550 words are quoted by Thayer himself from non-Christian authors, and though these authors are often post-Christian, there is no probability of their having learnt the words from the New Testament or from the mouth of Christians. A large number of other words have since then turned up in the inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca, and as regards the rest we must always ask in each case whether there is sufficient internal reason for supposing the word to be a Christian invention. Where one of these words is not recognizable at sight as a Jewish or Christian new formation we must consider it as a word common to all Greek until the contrary is proved.

The number of really new-coined words is in the earliest Christian period very small. There can hardly be more than 50 Christian new formations among the round 5,000 words of the New Testament vocabulary, that is, not 12 per cent. but 1 per cent. Primitive Christianity was a revolution of the inmost life of man, but not a revolution of the Greek lexicon—so might we, as modern philologists, vary the old witness of St. Paul, that “the kingdom of God is not in word but in power” (1 Cor. iv. 20). The great enriching of the Greek lexicon by Christianity did not take place till later in the ecclesiastical period, with its enormous development and differentiation of the dogmatic, liturgical, and legal vocabulary. In the religiously creative period the power

of Christianity to form new words was not nearly so large as its effect in transforming the meaning of the old words.

The New Testament lexicographer will therefore have to make himself familiar above all with the great range of sources for the Greek popular language from Alexander the Great to Constantine. His field is the world—that world which from the most ancient seats of Greek culture in Hellas and in the islands, in the little country towns of Asia Minor and in the villages of Egypt, as well as from the cosmopolitan trading centres on the shores of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, presents us year by year with memorials of itself, i.e., with actual documents of the living language which was the missionary language of St. Paul.

Studies such as those of E. L. Hicks in the *Classical Review*,¹ James Hope Moulton's lexical work in the *Expositor*,² Theodor Nägeli's *Examination of the Vocabulary of the Apostle Paul*,³ Wilhelm Heitmüller's book⁴ on the formula "in the name of Jesus," Gottfried Thieme's Heidelberg dissertation on *The Inscriptions of Magnesia on the Maeander and the New Testament*,⁵ Wendland's essay on the word Saviour (σωτήρ),⁶ and the excellent "Lexical Notes from the Papyri"⁷ just begun

¹ Vol. i., 1887, pp. 4-8, 42-6.

² April, 1901; February, 1903; December, 1903.

³ See above, p. 65, n. 1.

⁴ W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, Göttingen, 1905.

⁵ G. Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das Neue Testament*, Göttingen, 1906.

⁶ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1904, v., pp. 335-53.

⁷ *The Expositor*, January, 1908, and following numbers.

by J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, have all by this method obtained accurate results and laid the foundations for the future new Lexicon. Georg Heinrici¹ in his examination of the Sermon on the Mount from the point of view of the history of ideas has made valuable contributions by drawing materials from the old philosophical and ethical writers. Baljon² also, at least in the Appendix to his Dictionary, was able to incorporate some of the results of recent investigations. It will also be possible for synonymic studies to receive a new impetus from the new sources. Archbishop

¹ Georg Heinrici, *Die Bergpredigt . . . begriffsgeschichtlich untersucht*, Reformationsfestprogramm, Leipzig, 1905 (and as vol. iii. of Heinrici's *Beiträge*, Leipzig, 1905).

² See above, p. 86, n.

Trench's ¹ well-known work is the classical representative of the older philological method. Though in many points out of date, it is still the best work on New Testament synonymy, and a selection from it has lately been published in a German translation by Heinrich Werner.² The German *Synonymy of New Testament Greek* by Gerhard Heine ³ is quite elementary.

Any one who shall in future pursue studies in synonymy based on an intimate knowledge of the late Greek popular language, will without doubt come to the

¹ R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1854; 7th ed., 1871, last edition, 1906.

² *Synonyma des Neuen Testaments*, von R. Ch. Trench, ausgewählt und übersetzt von Heinrich Werner. Mit einem Vorwort von Prof. D. Adolf Deissmann. Tübingen, 1907.

³ Gerhard Heine, *Synonymik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Leipzig, 1898.

conclusion that the stock of concepts possessed by Primitive Christianity was much more simple and transparent than used formerly to be assumed. The concepts have hitherto been too much isolated ; for example, the differences between " Justification," " Reconciliation," and " Redemption " in St. Paul have been much more strongly emphasized than the relationship which before all things is recognizable between them. In particular the personality and the piety of the Apostle Paul appear much more compact and more impressive, if, avoiding the failings of the doctrinaire method as commonly employed in Germany by the Tübingen School and their opponents, we consider him against the background recoverable from the new

sources of the Graeco-Roman world as the great hero of the faith from the East.

Finally, there is great need for critical studies of the style of the separate books of the New Testament. In Eduard Norden's book¹ on *The Artistic Prose of the Ancients* will be found a number of fine observations, although his whole procedure in connecting the New Testament with Greek *artistic* prose is not correct. The greater part of the New Testament writings is not artistic prose but artless popular prose ; which, however, is often of greater natural beauty than the artificial products of the hollow rhetoric of post-classical antiquity. The words of Jesus and many

¹ Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom vi. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, Leipzig, 1898.

utterances of St. Paul and the other apostles are either instinct with a calm, chaste beauty that is æsthetically worthy of admiration, or else they are written with truly lapidary force, worthy of marble and the chisel. The importance of the New Testament in the history of style rests on the fact that through this book the language of natural life, that is, of course, language as it lived upon lips specially endowed by grace, made its entry into a world of outworn doctrine and empty rhetoric. It was a great mistake of Friedrich Blass¹ to try to represent St. Paul as an adherent of the Asian rhythm, so that, for example, the Epistle to the Galatians

¹ F. Blass, *Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1905. See *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, xxxi., col. 231 ff.

would be supposed to be written with due observance of the rhythmical rules of art. This error ranges Blass with a number of older writers by whom the Apostle Paul was praised for his great knowledge of classical literature.

Primitive Christianity—this is one of the main results of the modern philology of the New Testament—Primitive Christianity in its classical epoch is set in the midst of the world, but it still has very little connexion with official culture ; indeed, as an energetic and one-sided religious movement it is distrustful in its attitude towards the “ wisdom ” of the world.

It rejects—this is the second result of our inquiry—it rejects, in this epoch, all the outward devices of rhetoric. In grammar, vocabulary, syntax, and style it occupies a place in the midst of the people and draws from the inexhaustible soil of the popular element to which it was native a good share of its youthful strength.

In opposition to its later developments towards dogma, differentiation, and complexity—and this is the third result—in opposition to these later developments it is, in that classical epoch, in spite of the glowing enthusiasm of its hope, entirely simple and forceful, intelligible in its appeal to the simple and the poor in spirit, and therefore appointed to a mission to the whole world.

Modern New Testament philology, therefore—I may say in conclusion—does not mean any impoverishing of our conceptions of the beginnings of our faith. On the contrary, although apparently concerned only with the outward form of the New Testament, it opens up new points of view as regards its inward meaning, deepening our knowledge of Primitive Christianity and strengthening our love of the New Testament.

And if this study has brought together a band of workers from all Protestant countries on one common field—workers whom enthusiasm for Christ and His Cause and the desire for knowledge have united in one great brotherhood—then the philology of the New Testament, with this

international alliance in work, is helping in little to fulfil the great hope of the New Testament "that we may all be one in Christ."

